

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/703,144

Applicant(s)

HOYLE ET AL.

Examiner

Barry J. O'Brien

Art Unit

2183

## All Participants:

(1) Barry J. O'Brien.

(2) Robert Marshall.

Status of Application: Amended

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 March 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*4, 10 and 12*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Pentium Processor Family Developer's Manual Vol.3: Architecture and Programming Manual*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 3/9/2004, the examiner brought to the attention of Mr. Marshall that there was an antecedent basis problem in claim 4 that was the result of a cancellation of a claim, and asked if the claim could be amended by the examiner to correctly provide antecedent basis to claim 1 (instead of to cancelled claim 3). Furthermore, the examiner noted that claim 12 was not mentioned as either a claim still pending or a claim cancelled in the applicants remarks in his recently filed amendment, and that it appeared it was to have been cancelled in a similar fashion to claim 3. The applicant agreed to allow the examiner to amend claim 4 and cancel claim 12.

On 3/17/2004, the examiner contacted the applicant to inform him that new prior art was found after discussing the case with the examiner's supervisor which read upon claim 10. The examiner faxed this proposed prior art to the applicant for his review and asked for a proposed amendment to overcome the prior art and put the case in condition for allowance. The applicant then replied with a proposed amendment, that upon further consideration by the examiner and his supervisor did not fully overcome the prior art. The examiner submitted a proposed amendment back to the applicant which attempted to incorporate the main points discussed in the previously submitted proposed amendment. However, the applicant felt that this final proposed amendment limited the claim language more than he was entitled to, so requested that an action be sent out so the applicant could decide how to proceed. Therefore, no solution was reached, and the attached Final Rejection is being submitted, with the examiner amendments that were going to be made are instead in the form of objections in the attached Final Rejection..



EDDIE CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100